



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

TS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/876,839	06/16/97	HOLI	J. D. 2000-2001

JONES & ASKEW  
2400 MONARCH TOWER  
3424 PEACHTREE ROAD N.E. SUITE 2600  
ATLANTA GA 30326-1156

WM41/0119

EXAMINER

J. D. 2000-2001

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2604.2	17

DATE MAILED: 01/19/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>08/876,839</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Holt et al</b>
	Examiner <b>Benny Q. Tieu</b>	Group Art Unit <b>2642</b>
		

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Benny Q. Tieu

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Michael K. Dixon

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jan 10, 2001

Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-3

Identification of prior art discussed:

Morganstein (U.S. Patent No. 5,029,196) and Brennan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,329,578)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant states the differences between prior art and applicant's invention. Specially, applicant states that routing lists in claim 1 differ from the teachings in Morganstein and Brennan. Examiner disagreed and further explained how the claim language can be read by Morganstein and Brennan. Applicant will consider and amend the claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2.  Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.